

REMARKS

This response is made as being supplemental to the applicant's response previously mailed on January 18, 2006.

The applicant thanks examiner Moran for her feedback and responses by phone and mail from the general period of late February through mid-March 2006, to the applicant's January response. These discussions were centered around possible language for the proposed claims that may serve to overcome currently standing objections. It is the applicant's understanding that the revised claims and specification sent with her January 2006 response were not officially entered, and will be replaced by the claims and specification sent with this response. All changes sent with this response are relative to the last entered set of claims and specification, sent by the applicant on June 9, 2005.

Changes to claim language.

The applicant agrees to all changes suggested by the examiner in her advisory action sent mid-March 2006, except for the one matter regarding the language "first therapeutic resonant frequency", newly recited in sub-paragraph 4 of claim 1. Because there is material in the original specification which supports use of that phrase, the applicant is asking allowance of that language. The following locations in the original specification address this issue:

- page 8 lines 2-3 recites the phrase "first therapeutic resonant frequency".
- page 15 line 22 through page 16 line 2, recites "first therapeutic resonant frequency" two times when describing the process of dividing to a lower octave *after* finding the "first" frequency at a higher range. Likewise on page 16 lines 4-5 and in line 10, the phrase "first therapeutic resonant frequency" is used.
- at page 14 line 14, the word "therapeutic" is used in conjunction with the process of finding the initial frequency (by dividing the in-vivo velocity by the genomic wavelength).
- at page 15 line 4, the word "therapeutic" is used in conjunction with the alternate method of finding the initial frequency, when using the refractive index calculation method.

- at page 15 line 19, the word “therapeutic” is used in conjunction with the initial (in-vivo) frequency calculated for the *Borrelia burgdorferi* genome.
- at page 20 line 7, the word “therapeutic” is included in the sentence which instructs how to find the initial resonant frequency for the Rubella viral genome.

It is hoped that these locations in the original specification provide sufficient support for inclusion of the word “therapeutic” in the aforementioned section of claim 1. It may be helpful to note that the step of determining the velocity for the medium surrounding the genomic material is recited in claim 1 subparagraph 2, is a calculation prior to the step in subparagraph 4, and is *the* critical step necessary for making the procedure “therapeutic”; and that in subparagraph 4 (the one under discussion), that same velocity is used to calculate the “first” resonant frequency; therefore that frequency would be considered therapeutic by virtue of the fact that the correct velocity was used to compute it. Furthermore, the preamble of claim 1 states that it is a method of determining “therapeutic” resonant frequencies. Another way of stating it - there is no further adjustment necessary to the “first resonant frequency” (i.e., the step described in subparagraph 4), in order to render it “therapeutic”. The only other calculation that may be optionally used, is to make the octave adjustment of that frequency to accommodate whatever frequency device is being used. The applicant maintains that the initial or “first” frequency computation (computed by dividing the appropriate [in-vivo] velocity by genomic wavelength) is most likely therapeutic in nature, if such a device in that frequency range (usually near infrared or visible) is available to the user of the invention.

The applicant points out that she has added (in this response) the term “magnetic permeability” to the language in claim 4, which is supported in the specification at page 9 lines 8-11, and page 14 lines 8-13; this addition lends clarity and completeness to that claim.

The applicant has also changed in each claim after claim 1, the first appearance of the phrase “genomic material” to the more complete phrase “disease-associated genomic material”, to fully reflect the intent of the invention in all the claims.

The applicant has cancelled claims 11-13.

CONCLUSION

Applicant states that a full and complete response has been made herein to the past Office Action and Advisory mailed respectively October 18 2005 and in March, 2006 and as such, asks that all amended claims submitted in this application be placed in condition for allowance. The applicant respectfully requests early consideration of the present application, entry of the amendments to claims and specification, and withdrawal of all rejections.

Respectfully submitted,



Charlene A. Boehm

March 14, 2006

Charlene Boehm
320 Gilbert Rd.
Columbus, NC 28722
(828) 863-4317